

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests entry of the following remarks and reconsideration of the subject application. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments herein. The remarks and amendments should be entered under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 as they place the application in better form for appeal, or for resolution on the merits.

[0004] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1-29 are presently pending. Claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, and 25-27 are amended herein; no claims are withdrawn or cancelled herein; and no new claims are added herein.

Statement of Substance of Interview

[0005] The Examiner graciously talked with me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—on June 6, 2007. Applicant greatly appreciates the Examiner's willingness to talk. Such willingness is invaluable to both of us in our common goal of an expedited prosecution of this patent application.

[0006] During the interview, I discussed how the claims differed from the cited art, namely Kurowski. Without conceding the propriety of the rejections and in the interest of expediting prosecution, I also proposed possible clarifying amendments.

[0007] The Examiner was receptive to the proposals, and I understood the Examiner to indicate that the proposed clarifying claim amendments appeared to

clarify a difference between a client/server network connection and a client/server authenticated session. However, the Examiner indicated that she would need to review the cited art more carefully and/or do another search, and requested that the proposed amendments be presented in writing.

[0008] Applicant herein amends the claims in the manner discussed during the interview. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.

Formal Request for an Interview

[0009] If the Examiner's reply to this communication is anything other than allowance of all pending claims, then I formally request an interview with the Examiner. I encourage the Examiner to call me—the undersigned representative for the Applicant—so that we can talk about this matter so as to resolve any outstanding issues quickly and efficiently over the phone.

[0010] Please contact me or my assistant to schedule a date and time for a telephone interview that is most convenient for both of us. While email works great for us, I welcome your call to either of us as well. Our contact information may be found on the last page of this response.

Claim Amendments

[0011] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, and 25-27 herein.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 112

[0012] Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd ¶. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0013] Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103. In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that these rejections are moot. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw these rejections.

[0014] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone and/or in combination:

- **Brown:** *Brown, et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2003/0061288 A1;
- **Kurowski:** *Kurowski, et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2002/0019844; and
- **Polizzi:** *Polizzi, et al.*, US Patent Publication No. 2002/0023122.

Overview of the Application

[0015] The Application describes a technology for providing increased security without disrupting user workflow in a client-server environment. When a request is submitted from the client to the server, the re-authentication system verifies that the session is secure. If the re-authentication system cannot verify that the session is secure, the system persists (e.g., saves or maintains) the

request and directs the client to re-authenticate the session. When the client session is re-established, the re-authentication system directs the server to process the saved request, instead of requiring that the request be re-submitted from the client. (*Application*, page 2, line 25 – page 3, line 8.)

Cited References

[0016] The Examiner cites Brown as the primary reference, and cites Kurowski and Polizzi as secondary references.

Brown

[0017] Brown describes a centralized authentication and authorization system for providing users access to groups of network resources. Specifically, Brown describes a system and method for authenticating and authorizing users seeking access to resources on a network. (*Brown*, col. 1, lines 22-24.) Brown describes a walled garden via which multiple network-based services may be available. (*Brown*, col. 2, lines 46-50.) When a user wishes to access a service in the walled garden, the client sends an HTTP request including a ticket granting access to the walled garden. If the client does not provide a ticket or the ticket is invalid, the HTTP request is denied. (*Brown*, col. 2, line 66-col. 3, line 6.)

Kurowski

[0018] Kurowski describes a highly distributed computing environment in which very large computation intensive tasks are broken down into thousands of sub-tasks and then distributed to thousands of clients running on a variety of computers across the Internet. The idle CPU time of each of these thousands of client computers is used to perform these computations by running custom application modules in a low priority. A task server keeps track of information associated with each of the clients and uses the information to assign one or more tasks associated with a computing problem to each client computer. (Kurowski, Abstract.)

Polizzi

[0019] Polizzi describes processing jobs on an enterprise-wide computer system. (Polizzi, Abstract.)

Based upon Brown and Kurowski

[0020] The Examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 5-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Kurowski. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

[0021] Claim 1, as amended recites:

A method comprising:
establishing a session between a server and a client;
authenticating the session;
subsequent to authenticating the session, receiving at the server, via the session, a request from the client;
subsequent to receiving at the server, the request from the client, determining whether the session is still authenticated; and
in an event that the session is no longer authenticated:
persisting as a pending request at the server, the request from the client; and
in an event that the session is subsequently re-authenticated, the server processing the pending request.

[0022] As stated in the Office Action (pg. 4), Brown does not explicitly disclose persisting the client request as a pending request at the server. The Office Action cites Kurowski paragraphs [0208] and [0241] as disclosing the last two elements of claim 1.

[0023] Kurowski paragraph [0208] states, "For some of the operations the domain objects might depend on other subsystems that provide a persistence mechanism either to the local disk or to a server." While this portion mentions "a persistence mechanism" and "a server", this cited paragraph of Kurowski does not clearly disclose, "in an event that the session is no longer authenticated: persisting as a pending request at the server, the request from the client; and in an event

that the session is subsequently re-authenticated, the server processing the pending request," as claimed. In fact, as will be described further below, Kurowski describes storing data at a client device in an event that a network connection between the client and a server is down, but it does not appear that Kurowski makes any mention of whether or not a session between a client and a server is authenticated.

[0024] Kurowski paragraph [0241] describes some of the major responsibilities of the Task Manager, which include, "keeping track of when the network connection is down and then initiating saving of data to the local disk for later sending to the Task Server; storing any commands for the Task Server in a persistent queue if the network connection is down; and when a connection is reestablished after some time of being disconnected, go through the persistent queue and send all the things to the Task Server that are pending there."

[0025] Kurowski paragraph [0218] also provides a description of the Persistent Queue Management subsystem, which is described as managing a queue on the local disk (at the client).

[0026] It is important to note that the Task Manager is a subsystem of the *client* (see paragraphs [0019], [0234], and Figure 4). In other words, Kurowski describes determining that a network connection is down, and so, persisting *at a client*, data to be sent to the server when the network connection comes back up. Because Kurowski describes persisting the data because the network connection is down, Kurowski clearly does not suggest persisting a pending request from the client at the *server*. Furthermore, Kurowski does not appear to make any

reference to authentication, or authenticated sessions. Accordingly, there is no suggestion to combine the teachings of Brown and Kurowski.

[0027] A network connection that is down results in a lack of communication between a client and a server. This is different than a session between a client and a server, where the session is no longer authenticated. With a non-authenticated session, data can still be sent between the client and server.

[0028] Claim 1 has been amended to clearly indicate that the same session between the client and the server may at one time be authenticated, and at another time not be authenticated. As amended, claim 1 clearly defines a session between a client and a server. The session is authenticated, a request from the client is received at the server, and a determination is made as to whether or not the session is still authenticated. If the session is determined to be no longer authenticated, the session may be re-authenticated. In other words, the connection between the server and the client still exists – that is, the *same* session is authenticated, determined to be no longer authenticated, and then later, re-authenticated. If a network connection were dropped between the client and the server, a new session would have to be established, which is different than simply re-authenticating the same session that was previously authenticated.

[0029] For at least these reasons, claim 1 is allowable over Brown in view of Kurwoski, and Applicant respectfully requests that the 103 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

[0030] Claims 2, 3, and 5-11 ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent

claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0031] Independent claims 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, 25, and 27 recite elements that are similar to those recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claims 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, 25, and 27 are allowable over Brown in view of Kurowski for reasons similar to those stated above with reference to claim 1, and Application respectfully requests that the 103 rejection of claims 12, 13, 18, 22, 23, 25, and 27 be withdrawn.

[0032] Claims 14-17 ultimately depend upon independent claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0033] Claims 19-21 ultimately depend upon independent claim 18. As discussed above, claim 18 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0034] Claim 24 depends upon independent claim 23. As discussed above, claim 23 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, claim 24 may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0035] Claim 26 depends upon independent claim 25. As discussed above, claim 25 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, claim 26 may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

[0036] Claims 28 and 29 ultimately depend upon independent claim 27. As discussed above, claim 27 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Based upon Brown, Kurowski, and Polizzi

[0037] The Examiner rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Kurowski, and further in view of Polizzi. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 4.

Dependent Claim 4

[0038] Claim 4 depends upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim which depends from an allowable base claim is also allowable. Additionally, claim 4 may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Conclusion

[0039] All pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the **Examiner is urged to contact me before issuing a subsequent Action.** Please call/email me or my assistant at your convenience.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 7/23/07

By: Kayla D. Brant
Kayla D. Brant
Reg. No. 46576
(509) 324-9256 x242
Kayla@leehayes.com
www.leehayes.com

My Assistant: Carly Taylor
(509) 324-9256 x264
carly@leehayes.com